

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 ROY O'GUINN,

4 Plaintiff,

3:20-CV-0273-APG-CLB

5 v.

ORDER

6 LISA WALSH, et al.,

7 Defendants.
8

9 Plaintiff has filed multiple affidavits, notices, and/or improper responses which do not
10 appear to relate to any motion on file. (ECF Nos. 14, 16, 19, 22, 27, 29, 32, & 33). The Court
11 is not a repository for the plaintiff's affidavits or evidence. Plaintiff may not file evidence with
12 the Court unless it is used to support or oppose a motion. Therefore, ECF Nos. 14, 16, 19,
13 22, 27, 29, 32 & 33 are hereby **STRICKEN**.

14 Plaintiff is further advised that filing new motions or documents that are, in substance,
15 identical to documents he has already filed, and/or filing motions seeking "updates" or
16 immediate action on pending motions, will not increase the speed with which the court is
17 able to proceed in this case. The court has a heavy docket. Plaintiff's case is just one of
18 hundreds before the court. Thus, Plaintiff's repetitive (and borderline frivolous) filings only
19 *slow* the pace of this litigation by requiring the court's attention and consideration of small
20 and secondary matters instead of the central issues in this case.

21 The court has been lenient because plaintiff is a *pro se* party. However, this does
22 not give plaintiff a blank check to clutter the docket. See *Schenker v. Rowley*, No. 3:12-cv-
23 00174-LRH-VPC, 2013 WL 321688, at *3-4, 5-6 (D. Nev. Jan. 28, 2013). Plaintiff is warned
24 that his status as an indigent litigant will not dissuade the court from considering sanctions
25 against him for filing groundless and duplicative motions or other documents.

26 **DATED:** May 18, 2021

27 
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE